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years. My studying has been almost continuous since that date ever since my boyhood days. It was not my privilege to attend college; but its learning and the credit of it I have ever desired. And now it of course is my wish to have any degree conferred on me acknowledged generally. But whether this will be done or not, my thirst for learning must continue.

I am at present Rector of St. Paul's Church (Presbyterian Episcopal), Beaufort, North Carolina.

Very truly,

Wm. Matthias.

Beaufort, North Carolina.

Nov. 1, 1853.

William R. Harper, Ph. D.:

My dear Doctor,

What relation is there between the University of Chicago, of which you are President, and the National University at Chicago, or are they altogether two distinct institutions? You may remember me, if I tell you that I am one of the middle aged gentlemen that studied Hebrew in your Institute in Philadelphia at the Episcopal Divinity School two summers and at
the University of Pennsylvania one summer. Last summer I had conferred upon me the degree of D.D. by the National University at Chicago. I simply want to know if it is identical with the University which you represent.

The knowledge of Hebrew I received under you and your associates I often employ in examining texts of Scripture. I have also advanced in Latin and Greek, and so consult the Vulgate and Septuagint and the Greek Testament. I have studied extensively the mathematics and general sciences. I have read all Scripture and much of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers as published by the Christian Publishing Company.

Completed the four years' course of Theological Study as prescribed by the Methodist Episcopal Church for traveling Ministers, when a young man. When I came into the Episcopal Church I stood a scientific examination and then all the theological examinations (excepting in Hebrew) for the Diaconate and Priesthood, now many years ago. Spent one year as a regular matriculate in Jefferson Medical College, in Philadelphia—about four years ago. And I have been a close student from 8 o'clock in the morning to 10 o'clock at night almost every day for many
W.R. Harper, Ph.D.,
Yale University,
New Haven, Conn.

Sir:

For some time past I have observed your hostility to our growing work, but have simply ignored it as due to envy and jealousy. I have also believed that the truth would eventually act as a boomerang to bring disaster on yourself. But I now write to inquire whether it is possible that a certain person who styles himself "Bro. Price" has lately received a letter from you authorizing the publication of your opinion that this University is a "humbug".

I make this inquiry directly of you and I trust you will have the manliness to meet the issue squarely. I enclose postage for your reply. I will say frankly that it is my intention to settle this matter by a libel suit, as we are tired of misrepresentations.

And now, sir, permit me to inquire, if this University is a humbug, what must your own moribund enterprises be? We have gazed about our business and have not meddled with yours. Suppose we retaliate and accuse you of flagrant misrepresentations of the number of your students proving it by your own contradictory circulars or show in like manner that a degree can be obtained from your Chautauqua concern on conditions so slight that we would never dream of a Yale professor allowing them, and consider it a serious lowering of a proper standard? Or, suppose I should note the puerility of your methods and your ineffectiveness notwithstanding your alums and opportunities?

There is simply this difference between our work and yours—that we are bravely fighting a battle for the people and endeavoring to build up a great local University that will be a grand justification of our degrees and you are not even proposing to do anything of the kind. Altogether, it seems to me that you are not fit critic, whatever our faults or virtues. The fact is, I doubt whether you know much about us at all except that we are pushing you aside.

Yours inquiringly,

(Dictated)
For some time past I have observed your progress fairly closely. I have worked hard and have studied thoroughly. I have given it a lot of thought. I fully understand the importance of the course I am following. I believe it is important to me.

I am writing to request your assistance in the matter of a letter from you supporting the application of your student at the University of New Mexico. I am enclosing a letter from you supporting the application of your student at the University of New Mexico.

I have been considering the matter of a letter from you supporting the application of your student at the University of New Mexico. I am enclosing a letter from you supporting the application of your student at the University of New Mexico.

I would appreciate your assistance in this matter. I am enclosing a letter from you supporting the application of your student at the University of New Mexico.

I am enclosing a letter from you supporting the application of your student at the University of New Mexico.
VIEW OF EMINENT MEN OF THE RECENT PAST AND OF THE PRESENT CONCERNING A NATIONAL UNIVERSITY.

[The views herein contained are but points from passages to be found in the Senate Memorial of 1892 and from communications to the chairman of the National University Committee of One Hundred, by whose authority they are presented in this form for more convenient use. As a whole they constitute a needed counterpart to "Views of the Early Presidents," lately issued. In quoting the present heads of colleges and universities it has been necessary to here limit the number to one from each of the States represented; the object being simply to show that interest in the movement is wide as the country. It is expected, however, that the letters of these and all other members of the National Committee will later appear, and more at length, in connection with the report of the Senate Committee to Establish the University of the United States.]

* Hon. Daniel Webster, LL. D., on the educational duties of Government:
I doubt whether any one single law of any lawgiver, ancient or modern, has produced results of more distinct, marked, and lasting character than the ordinance of 1787, wherein it set forth and declared it to be a high and binding duty of Government to support schools and advance the means of education.

* Hon. Horace Mann, LL. D., of Massachusetts, pre-eminent as a leader in American education during the middle and third quarter of this century:
In our country and our time no man is worthy the honored name of statesman who does not include the highest possible education of the people in all his plans of administration.

* The late Thomas Hill, LL. D., former president of Harvard University:
A true university is the leading want of American education.

"An Alabamian" (supposed to have been the learned president of the University of Alabama), in the American Journal of Education:

We are in pressing need of an American university. We can have one if we will. Let us use the requisite means. We have excellent colleges; let them be sustained. We have excellent State universities (so called); let the States rally to their support. But the more these are multiplied and patronized, the louder and more urgent should be the demand for a National University.

The late Benjamin Peirce, LL. D., of Cambridge:
It seems to me that a great university in connection with the colleges and public schools is of the greatest importance, because it gives the only means of adapting education to every variety of intellect. * * * I know it is a popular doctrine that genius will find its way, but I doubt whether genius will necessarily be developed of itself. We have another popular doctrine much nearer to the truth, which is, that opportunity makes the man.

* Declarations which, though indirectly yet strongly, support the National University proposition.
Alexander Dallas Bache, LL. D., former Superintendent of the Coast Survey:
A great university, the want of our country in this our time, and the common school and college, fragments of a system requiring to be united into one.

The late Dr. Benjamin Apthorp Gould, LL. D., the astronomer, Yale University:
We want a university which, instead of complying with the demands of the age, shall create, develop, and satisfy new and unheard-of requisitions and aspirations, which, so far from adapting itself to the community, shall mold that community unto itself, and which through every change and every progress shall still be far in advance of the body social, guiding it, leading it, drawing it, pulling it, hauling it onward.

Hon. James Hall, LL. D., State Geologist of New York:
Touching your plan of a great National University, I need only say that you are quite at liberty to use my name in the publication which you propose.

The National Educational Association, which in 1869 resolved unanimously—
That, in the opinion of this Association, a great American university is a leading want of American education.

Also, in 1870, and again unanimously, that—
Such a university in America would at once become a power, influential alike in directing and furthering our material development, in elevating the character of the lower educational institutions of the country, and in awakening and sustaining higher conceptions of both individual and national culture; thus helping by a happy combination of our own more than Roman energy and religious faith with the grace and refinement of the Greek civilization to become a national university fully worthy of the future that awaits the United States.

The late President James McCosh, LL. D., of Princeton:
I like the idea of a National University of a character so high that it would not be a competitor of any existing institution.

Joseph Henry, LL. D., while Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution:
Yes, the Smithsonian Institution will do a noble work in the interest of science; but the Government of the United States should not content itself with even the wisest use of a foreign benefaction. It must and will devise such measures of its own for the advancement of knowledge as in course of time will become foundation stones for the upbuilding of a great university that will honor to American intelligence and help to make of this National Capital one of the chief intellectual centers of the world.

Hon. Salmon P. Chase, LL. D., while Chief Justice of the United States:
The higher education seems to be progressing in a general way, but the many institutions which represent it are without concurrence. If there were a really great university at this national center, with opportunities that would attract graduate students from all sections, and with standards and conditions that would in effect bring all collegiate institutions into relations with itself, this great deficiency would be met; besides which, the association of its multitude of students would tend to a community of feeling and so increase the security of the Republic. President Washington thought much of this, and made efforts and sacrifice for the founding of a National University, and the wonder is that Congress has not even yet taken a step in that direction.

The Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, in its unanimous report of the bill prepared by the Permanent University Committee of the National Educational Association:
No institution not established upon neutral ground or other than national in the important sense of being established by the people and for the people of the whole nation, and in part for a national end, could possibly meet all the essential demands to be made upon it.

Hon. Charles Sumner, LL. D., of Massachusetts, while U. S. Senator:
If we had in this National Capital such a university as that of Berlin, what an influence for the transformation of Washington, for an increase of the interest of the people of our country in the higher learning, for the advancement of knowledge among men, and for giving to this great and growing Republic the rank it should have among the nations of the earth.

Louis Agassiz, LL. D., late of Washington and Cambridge, in 1872:
Is it not possible to get the Congress of the United States so far interested in this great cause of the National University that it will find pleasure not only in establishing it, but in providing for it an endowment commensurate with the greatness of the country and with the pressing demands of the higher learning?

Hon. Andrew D. White, LL. D., ex-president of Cornell University, ex-minister to Russia, present member of the Venezuelan Commission in 1874:
The city of Washington is rapidly becoming a great metropolis. It is developing the atmosphere which is to give character to the executive, judicial, and especially the legislative business of the nation. What shall be its atmosphere? Shall it not rather be a capital where, with the higher satisfaction and force of civilized living, there shall be an atmosphere of thought upon the highest work in the most worthy fields, of devotion to the noblest aims? Such an atmosphere a great university, with the men and work involved in it, would tend to develop. In it demagogism would wither and corruption lose the main element of its support.

The late Hon. Timothy O. Howe, of Wisconsin, U. S. Senator and ex-Postmaster General:
In the convention which framed the Constitution of the United States the subject of a National University was somewhat considered. The proposition had won friends and no enemies there. It was in 1787 that James Madison, not of Massachusetts, but of Virginia, not a professional teacher, but a practical statesman, moved in convention at Philadelphia to clothe Congress with express powers to establish such a university. Doubtless the bills are imperfect. It is the business of legislation and the work of time to perfect them. If it be conceded that partial education is of some value, it will hardly be denied that thorough education is of more value. It was in this precise way that Washington and Madison (and Jefferson) so incessantly urged the Government to act.

President Ulysses S. Grant, in his message of December 1, 1873:
I would suggest to Congress the propriety of promoting the establishment in this District of an institution of learning or university of the highest class by donation of lands. There is no place better suited for such an institution than the National Capital. There is no other place in which every citizen is so directly represented
Hon. William T. Harris, LL. D., present U. S. Commissioner of Education, in an address of 1874 before the National Educational Association:

It behooves our Government to see to it that education is national and not sectional or sectarian or a matter of caste. On no other nation is this injunction so heavily laid. ** The importance of this movement to found a National University is fully apparent. Its advent will correct and prevent wrong tendencies in the direction of common schools, and likewise of colleges and private schools. It will be the source of supply for teachers and professors who shall take up the work of secondary education in the several States. From its lecture rooms will emanate the science that will solve our social and political problems and furnish the philosophy for a true statesmanship.

General John Eaton, LL. D., former U. S. Commissioner of Education:

Where else than at the seat of Government could there more fitly be the coming University of the land, where every qualified youth could freely pursue any branch of study or research desired? The Republic of Switzerland has already set the example in its Federal University. Then would be realized the ideal dream of the Father of his Country.

Rutherford B. Hayes, President of the United States, in his message of December 2, 1878:

To education more than to any other agency we are to look as the resource for the advancement of the people in the requisite knowledge and appreciation of their rights and responsibilities as citizens; and I desire to repeat the suggestion contained in my former message in behalf of the enactment of an appropriate measure by Congress for the purpose of supplementing with national aid the local systems of education in the several States.

The late Hon. L. Q. C. Lamar, ex-Senator, etc., as Secretary of the Interior:

If the various commissions, bureaus, and divisions of the executive departments at Washington which have for their object the prosecution of scientific research could be combined as integral parts of one scientific institution, such an institution would be of greater proportions and more comprehensive than any other in the world; and should a university be erected thereon, with a superstructure commensurate with the foundation, it would be without a rival in any country.

Ex-United States Senator George F. Edmunds, of Vermont:

In 1880, his introduction of a bill to establish the University of the United States and his causing the creation of a "Select Committee to establish the University of the United States."

In 1882: I am glad that you are still interested in "The National University." I think it of vast and far-reaching importance, and that it should be established and maintained in line with the fundamental principles of our Government.

In 1886, his cooperation in the forming of a National University Committee of one hundred and of an Executive Council of the same; his chairmanship of the committee which drafted the Hawley bill, now pending in the Senate, and his argument before the House Committee on Education in support of the same bill, as introduced by Mr. S. M. Clark, of Iowa.

Senator John Sherman:

The National University presents a very different question. I believe that such an institution, to secure an opportunity for higher education, may be properly established by the National Government.

The Nation, of December 12, 1890, in discussing the Edmunds bill:

It may be laid down as a rule that no real university can exist which is not governed by the faculty. A university at Washington so governed might be the glory of this country, for the riches of Washington in libraries and scientific facilities (it might have added scientific men) are now extraordinarily great.

The New York Times, of March 10, 1890:

An institution that would strengthen our whole educational system. ** When the ambitious youth has completed his college course he finds himself only on the outskirts of the field of knowledge, and if his ambition still speed him on he is obliged to go abroad to complete his education.

The emphatic endorsement of the National University, in 1891, by the Pan-Republic Congress, at Philadelphia, and by its Committee of Three Hundred, one of whose resolutions declared:

It is manifest that a truly National University, established at the seat of Government of the United States, and aiming, first, to complete the present incomplete system of American education; secondly, to promote the advancement of knowledge by the researches and investigation of its members, as well as by its influence on science and learning in other lands; and, finally, to encourage a larger intellectual intercourse and community of feeling among the leading minds of the world, would at once prove conservative of our free institutions, strengthen the bonds of fraternity among all peoples, and contribute to the betterment of governmental institutions everywhere.

Ex-Senator and ex-Secretary of the Interior Carl Schurz:

I wish you all success at the university-making. Shall be glad to help as I can.

Ex-Senator John J. Ingalls, in 1892:

I am cordially in sympathy. ** I only wish I had it in my power to render the enterprise active and efficient service. It is of supreme importance that the University should be established now.

Again, later:

My interest in the great work is unabated, and I shall be glad to do anything I can, at all times, to help it forward.

Hon. William Wirt Henry, LL. D., of Virginia:

Such a National University need not excite the jealousy of our many admirable institutions of higher learning, but should be made the capstone of the American educational system. ** Let us hope the day is not distant when an additional memorial will be offered to the memory of Washington—the most suitable of all—in the establishment of a grand national school of universal learning, one into which not only American students may proudly enter, but which shall also be attractive to the ambitious students of other lands.

Rev. John Henry Barrows, D. D., LL. D., President of the Columbian World's Parliament of Religions:

As regards the National University, I am very glad of the progress made and of the hopes entertained.

Right Rev. Thomas M. Clark, D. D., LL. D., Bishop of Rhode Island:

Allow me to ask that my name may be appended to the recommendations of the National University.
Right Rev. William Paret, D. D., LL. D., Bishop of Maryland:
Without pledging myself to all the details, I am warmly in favor of the general proposition to establish a National University in the city of Washington.

The American Philosophical Society, through its secretaries, Drs. George F. Barker, D. G. Brinton, and George H. Horn, and by authority:
This Society heartily sympathizes in all plans looking towards the promotion and dissemination of useful knowledge. The proposed National University, if established on sound principles, would undoubtedly contribute potently to this end, and such a scheme, therefore, merits the encouragement and support of all friends of the higher education.

Major Henry E. Alvord, president of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experimental Stations:
The project for the establishment of the University of the United States has always been of interest to me. * * * I trust that a realization of the long-cherished desires of the friends of this great enterprise is near at hand. Through the wise policy of the Federal Government in devoting a portion of the proceeds of public lands to education, endowments for research and higher instruction have been established in every state. * * * Although these institutions * * * constitute a national system, * * * it lacks a head. The proposed university, its sphere and relations carefully defined, offers a most appropriate and important finish to the provisions for higher education already made by the Government of the United States.

President Davis L. James, LL. D., of Cincinnati Society of Natural History:
I am sure that all patriotic citizens, and especially those who are interested in the advancement of science, will look with great satisfaction upon the establishment of a National University in the capital of the nation.

Commodore R. L. Pythian, U. S. N., Superintendent of the Naval Observatory:
An institution proposed by Washington and endorsed by the most distinguished men of his own and succeeding generations, is well worthy of the intelligent efforts now being made to found it upon a secure basis. I shall deem it an honor to be enrolled among the supporters of the enterprise, and shall cheerfully lend my own humble efforts towards its success.

Hon. N. H. Winchell, Ph. D., State Geologist of Minnesota:
I am heartily in sympathy with the National University project, and shall be glad to co-operate in any way in my power to the desired end.

Dr. J. S. Billings, U. S. A., lately Director of the Army Medical Museum, present Director of the Laboratory of Hygiene, etc., University of Pennsylvania:
I am much interested in the plan for a National University, and shall do what I can to call attention to the need of action by Congress.

Hon. Carroll D. Wright, U. S. Commissioner of Labor:
Relative to the National Post-graduate University at Washington, I would say that I have always been in favor of the establishment of such a university.

Hon. W. W. Duffield, LL. D., Superintendent of the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey:
You seem to have covered the whole ground, and I do not think your plan can be improved or even modified to advantage. I shall always be glad to aid in every possible way in carrying out your plans to a successful result.

Hon. T. C. Mendenhall, LL. D., while Superintendent of the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey:
The National University leaflet has put the matter in excellent form. * * * I hope you will not grow weary in pushing this matter.

Hon. Gardiner G. Hubbard, LL. D., President of the National Geographic Society:
I believe in the necessity for a National University, and am ready to help on the movement by every means in my power. We have the public schools of every grade, the colleges and State universities; now let us have a grand central university of the United States that shall crown and complete the whole series.

S. P. Langley, LL. D., Secretary of the Smithsonian Institute:
I take pleasure in authorizing the use of my name on the Committee of One Hundred for the furtherance of the establishment of a National University at Washington.

Lester F. Ward, LL. D., before the American Association for the Advancement of Science:
The National University recommended by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and many later Presidents and statesmen is almost certain to be realized in the near future. * * * It should be distinctly national, the creature of the American people, and devoted to their uses and needs. To this end it should be located at the seat of Government. It should also be, in the fullest sense, representative, as is the Government itself.

Hon. Simon Newcomb, LL. D., Superintendent of the Nautical Almanac:
Among other important advantages the National University would be an eminently appropriate key-stone to our educational system. Whenever there is anything to be done in the university matter let me know and I will be on hand, if possible. [The learned Doctor's argument before the Senate Committee in behalf of pure science and the duty of the Government to further it in the most effective as well as comprehensive manner by founding the proposed National University was impressive and unanswerable.]

Hon. Chas. D. Walcott, LL. D., Director of U. S. Geological Survey:
I fully believe in establishing such a university in the interest of higher education, and I cordially endorse the statements made by the late President James C. Wellsing * * * on this subject. The statements and views expressed in the "Memorial" are so comprehensive and exhaustive that I do not know that I could add to them, except to record my personal approval of the movement.

Hon. W. G. Vansey, Interstate Commerce Commissioner:
Many thanks for the "Memorial" in regard to a National University. Without having given the subject studied investigation or consideration, it has always awakened feelings of pride and patriotism in my heart, and I am very glad that it has the benefit of a vigorous and intelligent support.
Ex-Governor John Lee Carroll, LL. D., of Maryland, General President of the Society of the Sons of the Revolution:

I am one of those who believe that we cannot do too much in the way of maintaining colleges and universities for the education and accomplishment of our people.

[It is proper to add that Mr. Carroll's address in support of the university proposition before the House Committee on Education was an admirable one, taking the broadest and highest ground.]

Hon. Louis C. Hughes, Governor of Arizona:

I most heartily endorse the proposition to establish a National University. The good results which must flow therefrom will be so general and far-reaching that if due consideration is given it I believe it will have the earnest approval of Congress.

Hon. John H. McGraw, Governor of Washington:

I beg to say that I am heartily in favor of establishing a National Post-graduate University at the National Capital, and that I desire to be numbered among the friends of that enterprise.

Hon. Mark W. Harrington, Ph. D., while Chief of the Weather Bureau:

I have looked over the "summary" with very great interest. The plan is a broad one, and I do not know that I have any suggestions to make.

H. Randall Waite, Ph. D., president of the American Institute of Civics, New York:

I am much interested in the efforts to promote the establishment of a National University, and trust that they will be successful.

Edmund J. James, LL. D., president of the American Academy of Political and Social Science:

I shall be glad to serve on any committee in behalf of the National University. Command my services to the fullest extent in this matter. I know of no one thing in American education more important.

D. G. Brinton, LL. D., President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science:

I am quite willing that my name should be added to the National University, as proposed.

Francis E. Nipher, LL. D., president of the Academy of Science of Saint Louis:

I favor the idea of establishing a National University at Washington, if it is properly organized.

Mr. Henry Baldwin, Custodian of American History:

I am exceedingly anxious that the bill before Congress for the National University shall meet with favor. I believe it is a necessity for the complete education of our people, and I see no other way to insure a uniform educational system than by adopting some method in this direction.

Hon. Charles R. Keyes, Ph. D., State Geologist of Missouri:

I trust that there will be established at the capital of the nation a National University, liberally supported by the Federal Government. The facilities at Washington for post-graduate and original work are so superior that it becomes the duty of the nation to establish and maintain at that center an institution for advanced study. I sincerely hope that the pending bill will become a law.

Edward Everett Hale, D. D., LL. D., of Massachusetts:

I certainly am very much interested in the plan for the National University, and I think if it is wisely pressed something important will come of it.

The Hon. J. E. Richards, Governor of Montana:

Relative to the establishment of a National Post-graduate University at Washington, I will say that such an enterprise meets my warmest approval. I cannot conceive of anything better calculated to keep up the high standard of American school-life.

There can be no question as to the superior facilities afforded by Washington, in so far as the various fields of investigation are concerned.

Ex-U. S. Senator Joseph M. Carey, of Wyoming:

I am heartily in favor of the establishment of a great National University in Washington. The United States is directly interested in many of our educational establishments, especially in the State universities and in the colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts—nay, in agricultural experimentation. I wish every success in the endeavors to bring about at an early day an institution that will be a credit to the people of the United States.

Hon. Oscar S. Strauss, ex U. S. Minister to Turkey:

I note with pleasure the progress making with the National University measure, and shall co-operate as I can.

Hon. James F. Wilson, late United States Senator for Iowa:

I have yours of the 14th instant (January, 1895), in regard to the bill to establish a National University, and I assure you that it will give me pleasure to co-operate with the friends of the measure in every way I can.

Hon. Cephas Brainerd, LL. D., of the International Peace and Arbitration Organization, New York:

I am very busy and not likely to be very useful in a new matter, but am quite willing to help, if I can, about the National University.

General Horace Porter, LL. D., of New York, President General of the Sons of the American Revolution:

I wish you every success, and regret more than I can express having to absent myself from the coming meeting.

Lieutenant General John M. Schofield, United States Senator:

I take pleasure in authorizing the use of my name as one of the National University Committee.

Major General Nelson A. Miles, U. S. A., commanding the Army:

I consider it a high privilege to be a member of this (National University) committee.

Hon. Wayne McVeagh, LL. D., present Ambassador to Italy:

I warmly sympathize with the efforts to establish a post-graduate university of the highest possible standard at Washington. It is a noble undertaking, and I wish every success in it.
Ex-United States Senator Patrick Walsh, of Georgia:
I am in favor of the proposition to establish a National University at Washington, * * * and may be referred to as one of its friends.

Hon. John A. Kasson, LL. D., ex-member of Congress, lately United States Minister to both Austria and Germany:
The establishment of a National University in this District for the purposes indicated by President Washington, and for the further objects required by the wonderful progress of science and the arts in our own time, has long been most earnestly desired by me.

Chauncey M. Depew, LL. D., of New York:
It would be a long step forward in popularizing higher education if the Government should establish at Washington a great National University. As at Oxford or at Cambridge there are historic colleges with foundations running for hundreds of years, each having its own traditions, but all part of the university, so in every State there would be colleges, each having its own traditions, and yet all of them belonging to the grand university which will represent the culture of the new world—the University of the United States.

Hon. A. H. Garland, ex-United States Senator and ex-Attorney General of the United States:
I am glad that the university cause is progressing. To my mind it is the most important of all the projects now before the country, and I sincerely hope it will go on to completion. For one I am ready to contribute my best efforts towards it. * * *

[It is worthy of remark that General Garland, having shared with Charles Sumner, J. W. Patterson, Timothy O. Howe, and others in framing the bill of 1872, was also, as member of the Executive Council of the National University Committee, active in framing the present one.]

The Senate Select Committee to Establish the University of the United States, Senator Redfield Proctor, of Vermont, chairman. From their report of March 3, 1893:

Your committee are of the opinion that the cause of American learning demands such an institution as this bill provides for; that the highest dignity and welfare of the nation demand it; that it should be established at the Capital of the country, and that, after a delay of one hundred years since it was first proposed and sought to be established by the founders of the Government, it would be unworthy of so great a people to wait longer for a more favorable time in which to meet all these high demands. The committee therefore unanimously approve the bill and recommend its passage.

The Senate Select Committee to Establish the University of the United States, Senator Eppa Hunton, of Virginia, chairman. From their report of May 24, 1894:

Progress in the higher education has indeed been made in this country since the revival of efforts for the proposed National University [twenty years ago], but the growth of science, the needs of the people, and the demands of the age have more than kept pace with the increase of instrumentalities, so that relatively we are no nearer the goal—the realization of the hopes so long cherished by the patriots and scholars of the nation—than before. * * *

It is for America to say whether she will be content to lag forever in the rear of nations so greatly her inferior in resources. * * *

Firmly believing that the proposed University is essential to the completeness and highest efficiency of the American system of educational instrumentality, and that its early establishment is demanded by the honor of the Republic, * * * the committee unanimously affirm their approval of the bill as amended and recommend its passage by the Senate.

U. S. Senator Eppa Hunton, of Virginia, in his speech before the Senate December 13, 1894:

It [the proposed University] will afford to the youth of this country thrusting for the highest attainments in knowledge and intellectual power the opportunity to satisfy their ambitions at the fountain provided at home. It will spread abroad in our land the desire for the highest education, and inform the ambitious student in our colleges that when he shall have mastered all that is taught there new and higher opportunities still lie before him and within his reach. It will tend to educate large numbers of young men in the science of government, who in turn will educate the people, the real governors in this country. It will keep at home the young men who cannot at present here gratify all their intellectual cravings. It will draw students from foreign lands as soon as it is known that this institution carries education to a higher plane and is better equipped for the work of investigation than any other. It will elevate, energize, and enlarge the minds of our own people, and especially of those who by the cultivation of their powers may hope for a conspicuous part in conducting our governmental affairs and in defending the Constitution itself.

U. S. Senator William F. Vilas, of Wisconsin, from speech of December 13, 1894:

I regard it a privilege to contribute voice and vote to this measure. After more than a century's waiting there are embodied in it the patriotic dreams, the generous hopes of the noblest of them who laid the foundations of this nation. Regardless of all dividing opinions, on this project were united the chief spirits who gave form to the liberty and constitutional order of America. Washington and Franklin, Adams and Jefferson, Madison and Monroe, Wilson, Pickering, Rutledge, Randolph, all whose words are saved, no voice dissenting, shared with paternal wisdom and affection in the conception of this institution as the crowning ornament of the Republic. * * *

The University of the United States ought to enter no field held by the educational systems of the States or institutions of private benevolence; but beyond and above these, standing upon and supported by them, the Federal establishment should rise for the advancement and accumulation of learning—the crown, the head, the center, the illuminating sun of all.

U. S. Senator James H. Kyle, of South Dakota, from speech of December 18, 1894:

The failure to establish such an institution cannot be laid to poverty, for we are, one of the richest nations of the earth. We cannot say that the people do not want it, for it has been the dream of scholars and statesmen for a hundred years. We can explain our failure to provide it only by the fact that our minds have been wrapped up in the material welfare of a new and rapidly growing nation. * * *

The aim is to plant a University which shall be different from the ordinary American institution. It will begin where the others leave off, and will be in no sense a competitor. It will rather add to their usefulness by providing possibilities for the undergraduates and stimulating the ambition of those gifted with special talent. * * *

With such an institution the United States would at once take rank in facilities for higher education with the most advanced nations.
Charles Sprague Smith, Ph. D., New York, once leader in the movement to establish a National University upon Columbia College as a foundation: 
Glad to know that the work is progressing. The National University will come. 
May I be able to help in some measure.

The late James C. Welling, D. D., LL. D., president of Columbian University, District of Columbia:
Such a university as I here prefigured would come into no rivalry with any existing institution under the control of any denomination. It would aim to be the crown and culmination of our State institutions, graduating graduates from them and repaying its debt by contributing in turn the inspiration of high educational standards, and helping also in its measure to train the experts, ** * * who should elsewhere strive to keep alive the traditions of a progressive scholarship. ** * * It is not enough that our colleges should perpetuate and transmit the existing sum of human knowledge. We must have our workers on the boundaries of a progressive knowledge if we are to establish our hold on the directive forces of modern society.

President B. L. Whitman, D. D., LL. D., Columbian University, D. C.:
I am strongly in favor of a National University for graduate work. It seems as if the country owed it to itself to establish such an institution, and upon a scale in keeping with the greatness of our national life.

President Daniel C. Gilman, LL. D., Johns Hopkins University:
I firmly believe that a National University will be established in Washington, and I hope to see it founded upon such principles and with such funds that it will support all other agencies for the advancement of superior education.

Ex-President William Pepper, M. D., LL. D., University of Pennsylvania:
If by the united effort of all the friends of the movement the present bill can be passed and become law it will doubtless be an easy matter in future years to secure any amendment found desirable. You may depend upon it that I will cordially cooperate. ** * * The more rigidly the operations of the proposed University are limited to the field of post-graduate instruction the better. I shall always be ready to do all in my power.

President George W. Atherton, LL. D., Pennsylvania State College:
The establishment at Washington of a National University of the broadest scope and supported by ample income is, in my judgment, one of the most important projects now before Congress. It is a measure worthy of the most earnest efforts of the highest statesmanship. Not only could such a University contribute immensely to the growth of a sound and vigorous citizenship, but there is in our present conditions a peculiar reason why it would be of incalculable service to the cause of public education throughout the United States. It is the peculiarity of all institutions in a free country that they spring up and grow spontaneously and to some extent irregularly, so that they often fall of proper correlation and mutual support. ** * * We have all the elements of a magnificent system leading up to one institution which should crown and dignify and inspire the whole.

President William J. Patton, D. D., LL. D., Princeton University:
I have, however, paid some attention lately, and as a result I am entirely favorable to the action contemplated in the bill just now before Congress, and it gives me pleasure to say that I desire to be counted among those who favor the National University measure.

President Seth Low, LL. D., Columbia College, New York:
There is undoubtedly very much to be said in favor of a National University at Washington.

Chancellor H. M. MacCracken, LL. D., University of the City of New York:
The co-ordinating and strengthening of the higher schools of our country is so necessary that I shall favor the establishment of a University at Washington if it be given means that will enable it to undertake hopefully the achievement of this desirable result. The other objects proposed are worthy, but this one, which can be attempted from no other point so well as from our capital, especially recommends itself to my mind.

George Williamson Smith, LL. D., president of Trinity College, Connecticut:
I regret that the bill for the establishment of the University of the United States failed to pass at the last session of Congress. I hope that the matter will be pushed in the next Congress to a successful issue.

President E. Benjamin Andrews, LL. D., Brown University, Rhode Island:
The enterprise impresses me more and more as a wise one. If my name on the Committee of One Hundred will be of service I shall be most happy to have it there.

President E. H. Capon, D. D., LL. D., Tufts College, Mass:
Washington affords unusual advantages for a great National University, and if such an establishment can be properly sustained it will be of incalculable benefit to education, not only in the United States, but throughout the world.

President A. W. Harris, Sc. D., Maine State College:
What are the chances of success? I shall be pleased to render such assistance as I can.

President J. G. Schurman, LL. D., Cornell University:
I believe very strongly in the project of a National University at Washington. The resources of the people of the United States concentrated at that one point are running shamefully to waste for want of specialists to utilize them in the cause of original research and for the enlargement of human knowledge. ** * * I shall be glad to serve the cause whenever it lies in my power.

Vice-President P. B. Reynolds, D. D., West Virginia University:
I am fully convinced of the great importance of such an institution, and sincerely hope that the efforts to establish it may succeed.
President Lyon G. Tyler, LL.D., College of William and Mary, Virginia:

It gives me great pleasure to repeat the assurances already given of my hearty endorsement of the splendid design of a National University. * * * Of all questions this is one as to which there should be least difference of opinion.

President G. T. Winston, LL.D., The University of North Carolina:

I am in hearty sympathy with the movement to establish a National University and shall give it such aid as I can.

The existence of such a University would do more to destroy political corruption and to inform our people upon political subjects and abuses than any other or all agencies in existence.

President Richard C. Jones, LL.D., University of Alabama:

"A National Post-graduate University!" No greater stimulus could be given to the cause of higher education in the United States than the establishment of such an institution. I am heartily in favor of it.

J. W. Nicholson, LL.D., President Louisiana State University:

Without entering into details, suffice it to say that, in my humble judgment, the scheme of a National University as outlined in the Senate Memorial is eminently a move in the right direction and has my unqualified endorsement.

Chancellor R. B. Fulton, LL.D., University of Mississippi:

Undoubtedly such an institution, if so organized and managed as to have its functions entirely outside of those of the State and other universities, could be made the grand capstone in our educational system. Its establishment would be a fitting monument to the wisdom of the founders of our Government, who so well recognized the necessity for education to the preservation of our institutions, as well as to the great advances of this closing century.

President Charles W. Dabney, LL.D., University of Tennessee:

I appreciate the honor of being a member of the National Committee of One Hundred, and shall be very glad to assist the cause of the National University in any way in my power.

Charles Louis Loos, LL.D., President of Kentucky University. From letter of 1895:

It [Senate Memorial of 1892] is a document of unusual force. Its arguments and conclusions struck me with deep conviction. I do not see how any just objection can be urged against the noble aim so earnestly advocated. * * * Such an institution as it contemplates we need and have not. * * * I hope it will be successful in the coming Congress, if not in this.

From letter of November, 1895:

Don't give up. The purpose is a right one and I know it will meet the approval of enlightened men.

President W. H. Scott, LL.D., while in charge of the Ohio State University, April, 1895:

I trust that the next Congress will find time to give careful and, if necessary, protracted attention to the subject of a National University. Shall be glad to render any assistance in my power.

President James B. Angell, LL.D., University of Michigan:

Glad that your zeal seems unquenchable in spite of all the discouragements and delays. * * * It seems to me that the plan suggested is the wisest practicable one.

President Joseph Swain, LL.D., University of Indiana:

I should very much like to see a National University of the very highest grade in Washington. It would be a fitting climax to our public school system.

President William P. Harper, LL.D., University of Chicago:

I rejoice in the onward movement to establish the University of the United States. I sincerely hope that early action of Congress on this bill may be secured. Whatever I can do to forward the movement will most gladly be done.

President Charles S. Schaeffer, LL.D., State University of Iowa:

As to the main question, I am perfectly willing to admit that I was formerly opposed to the establishment of a National University, but I am now firmly of the opinion that if we are to take the high stand in education to which we are justly entitled, the United States as a nation must establish such an institution. It would have a stimulating influence upon all the machinery, and I can only hope that the day will quickly come when the National University may be established.

President Charles Kendall Adams, LL.D., University of Wisconsin:

Thus fully did Washington set forth his views. With what wisdom and presence did he behold what was before the country. He foresaw the sectional jealousies that were likely to spring up in immature minds, educated under foreign skies, and he sought to avert them. * * * He labored under no such pestilent delusion as to suppose that an education in the rudiments of knowledge is a guarantee against the political dangers that were to be averted. It was a university—a university in the broadest and highest sense of the term—that was the peculiar object of his solicitude.

You may count me among the friends of the measure, with hopes for immediate success.

President Cyrus Northrup, LL.D., University of Minnesota:

I take pleasure in saying that an executive council, constituted in the manner proposed, would be exceedingly helpful to the cause.

President Webster Merrifield, LL.D., University of North Dakota:

I most heartily favor the establishment of a great National University for post-graduate work only, in general accordance with the plan outlined in the bill now before the Senate. Such an institution should be adequately endowed, not depending upon current appropriations for maintenance, and should be securely guarded against political influence. * * * It is greatly needed to complete our system of public schools and State universities.

President Joseph W. Mauck, LL.D., University of South Dakota:

It will be a pleasure to do all in my power to further the aims of the National University Committee, as it is my hope to see its efforts eventually rewarded by the complete consummation of its plans.

Chancellor George E. MacLean, The University of Nebraska:

For years I have been a believer in the desirability of the establishment of the University of the United States at Washington. You may therefore add my name to your list. I shall be happy to be kept informed of the progress of the agitation and to contribute, if I may, to its success.
President R. H. Jesse, LL. D., University of the State of Missouri:
I should be glad to aid the good cause in any way.

Dr. Daniel Read, while President of the Missouri State University:
I cannot treat as visionary that which Washington recommended and James Madison and John Quincy Adams advocated, and which other great and patriotic men have zealously urged as a means of elevating all our higher institutions of learning, and of giving unity and concentration of effort to literary and scientific men—constituting, indeed, a bond of unity to the nation itself.

F. H. Snow, LL. D., Chancellor of the University of Kansas:
I trust that the National Congress will soon make a great National University an actuality and place it upon a basis that will command the respect of the educational world.

President D. R. Boyd, Ph. D., etc., Oklahoma University:
Regarding the National University, I shall be glad to contribute in any way in my power to its success.

James H. Baker, LL. D., president of the University of Colorado:
I believe a National University under the control of the United States Government is sure to be founded in a few years. Such an institution for the highest research would be the logical outcome of our free institutions and of our public-school system. The elementary school for the district; the high school for town and city; the State university for the State; the National University for the whole country.

President J. E. Talmage, Sc. D., Ph. D., F. R. S. (Edin.), etc., University of Utah:
I assure you of my deep interest and of my desire to co-operate heartily in the work of establishing a University of the United States. Kindly advise me of anything I can do to further the cause.

President J. E. Stubbs, LL. D., Nevada State University:
I concur in the view that a National University established by the Government would be a fitting keystone to the educational arch made up of the State universities, which have been largely established and strongly promoted by the General Government. Shall be pleased to co-operate with others in securing the necessary legislation.

President C. C. Stratton, LL. D., Portland University, Oregon:
Touching the National University proposed, it will give me pleasure to contribute my influence in every practicable way toward the end in view.

David S. Jordan, LL. D., president of Leland Stanford University, in speaking of the pending bill offered by the National University Committee of One Hundred:
There is no work our Government can undertake so important as the establishment of a National University for advanced and special work at the National Capital. The bill seems to me to be exactly what is wanted as it now stands. Its passage would be the most important event that has occurred since the war.
George Henderson, Esq.,

Director, etc.,

Chicago, Ill.,

Dear Sir:—

In reply to your communication of January 17th, relative to the National University of Illinois, and as to whether such University was ever granted a charter by this State, I have to say, that upon an examination of the files of the office of the Secretary of State, I find that on the 25th day of July, 1889, a certificate was filed, asking for the incorporation of the National University. The object for which such application was made was to organize an institution for instructing persons through college courses, and conferring appropriate degrees. The location of the institution was to be at Chicago, in the County of Cook, and State of Illinois. The Directors to control and manage such corporation, for the first year of its corporate existence were: F. W. Harkins, A. V. Garman, J. T. Sutor, I. I. Cook, and Rev. George James Jones. That upon such application or certificate, the said,
LACHMANSBURG

GREAT FALLS, W. Va.

Nov. 8, 1862

SIR:

I have the honor to call your attention to the following facts:

On the 23d of May, 1862, a party of the 31st Indiana were reported at the little station of the line, now known as Lachmansburg. This party was composed of five officers and forty men.

On the 25th of May, under the direction of the late Major-General Thomas, this party was divided into two bodies and sent to different places.

On the 26th of May, the two bodies were reunited, and were ordered to join the regiment at Lachmansburg. This order was carried out, and the regiment was ordered to report to Major-General Thomas.

On the 27th of May, the regiment was ordered to report to General Scott, and was directed to proceed to the vicinity of Antietam. This order was also carried out, and the regiment was placed in position for battle.

I have the honor to submit this report to your attention, and to request that it may be brought to the notice of the proper authorities.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

[Signature]
the National University was duly incorporated on the 25th day of July, 1889.

In your letter you speak of the National University of Illinois, you will observe that the institution of which I write you, is the National University. Whether the National University and the National University of Illinois are one and the same thing, I, of course, have no means of ascertaining. So far as I am able to discover, there is no record of the National University of Illinois ever having been chartered by this State. But I take it that the institution you refer to, and concerning which you write me, is the National University. Any further information that I can give you touching this institution, will be cheerfully supplied.

Very truly yours,

M. J. Moloney by
F. W. F. Anonymous, Assistant
Dear Sirs,

I have the honor to address this letter in the capacity of the President of the Board of Regents of the University of California. I trust you will permit me to call the attention of the University to the fact that the period of the session has now elapsed, and that the Board of Regents have called a special meeting of the faculty for the purpose of considering the necessity of extending the period of the session.

I urge upon you the importance of this matter, and I trust you will give it your careful consideration.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
Beaufort, North Carolina,
Nov. 14, 1893.

William R. Harper,
President Chi. Uni. Dear Sir,

Your answer to my question has just been received, for which please accept my thanks.

You call the National University a humbug, even a first-class one. You cannot say it is not regalized to bestow degrees upon those who stand even higher than the honored of "regular" institutions, and there are many such. If its practice is contrary to its charter rights, how is it that the many regular institutions
Dear Mr. Matthews,

I have just heard from the bank that my account has been moved to the new building. I do not know when you plans for the new building will be finished, but I hope they will be soon. I have heard a lot of stories about the new building, but I don't know if they are true or not. I have heard that it is going to be very spacious and well-lit. I hope that it will be ready in time for the opening.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
UNIVERSITY OF THE UNITED STATES.

A REPLY TO "VIEWS OF THE MINORITY."

As submitted to the United States Senate by Mr. Walthall, of Mississippi, on April 8, 1896.

By John W. Hoyt,

[Chairman of the National University Committee of One Hundred.]

The report of the Senate Committee to Establish the University of the United States, recently submitted by Senator Kyle, chairman, with the cordial concurrence of Senators Hawley, of Connecticut; Sherman, of Ohio; Frye, of Maine, and Mitchell, of Wisconsin, was supposed when in preparation to have also the approval of the other members. It embraces not only the views of the present Committee, with leading portions of the unanimous reports submitted by chairmen Proctor and Hunton in 1893 and 1894, respectively, and the affirmative arguments before the Senate and House committees by ex-Senator Edmunds, ex-Provost William Pepper, of Pa., Dr. Simon Newcomb, General John Eaton, President Gardiner G. Hubbard, ex-United States ministers John A. Kasson and Andrew D. White, and of ex-Governor John Lee Carroll, President of Sons of the Revolution, but also a review of the objections made by officers of the so-called "American University" and others, a list of members of the National University Committee of One Hundred, and some 300 letters from approving jurists, statesmen, college presidents, State superintendents, heads of scientific bureaus and learned bodies, and numerous other men of distinction in various departments of life.

Both on account of its weight of argument and because of the great number of distinguished men most competent to express an opinion upon such a matter, whose important communications are embraced, the majority report is so convincing that, if it were sufficiently available for the National Committee's use, no further publication would be deemed necessary. Nevertheless, since it is not thus available and because a minority report was finally submitted, whose erroneous statements, fallacies, and half-supporting views of a few university presidents seem to challenge some attention, I am moved to this brief review of the same, to the end that the nature and weakness of the opposition may be made yet more conspicuous.

For convenience of reference I shall deal with the contents of the minority report in the order of their occurrence.
"ATTEMPTS TO FOUND A NATIONAL UNIVERSITY."

Of the minority's quotations under this head, from some anonymous writer, it is proper to say that a number of them are grossly incorrect historically, while as a whole they give such evidence of an unfriendly bias in general terms as to invalidate their claims to confidence.

For example, it is not true that Washington's plan for a National University was ever "rejected," it was simply "neglected"; nor is it true that a committee of Congress, reporting unfavorably upon the plan submitted in 1810, deemed it "unconstitutional for the Government to found, endow, and control" such an institution. What the committee did say is this:

"The Constitution does not warrant the creation of such a corporation by any express provision. But under the right to legislate exclusively over the District, wherein the United States have fixed their seat of government, Congress may erect a University at any place within the ten miles square ceded by Maryland and Virginia. This cannot be doubted." (Ex. Docs. 11th Congress, 2d sess., p. 975.)

True, there have been those who questioned the authority of Congress in this regard because of the absence of any express provision in the Constitution; but they were most emphatically in the minority at the beginning of the Government, and constitutional objection has long since ceased to be urged by statesmen. Indeed, today there is probably not a constitutional lawyer in the country who would risk his reputation by denying that the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress in the District of Columbia furnishes the amplest authority for the founding here of an institution in which the public welfare may demand.

Again, the minority are less than just in the declaration that "there is no effort to conceal the fact that the Government is to provide the necessary funds [i.e., all the funds] to secure the establishment and maintenance of the University, involving, it is believed, an outlay of an immense amount of money." On the contrary, provision is made in section 14 of the pending bill for receiving gifts and bequests and for their investment in bonds of the United States; and there is a reasonable expectation that such gifts and bequests, made after the example of Washington, will become very common and very great, the University offering, as it would, opportunities not only for a most judicious as well as patriotic use of funds, but also for making such gifts in the face of the whole world and with a certainty of corresponding distinction for the giver. The minority should know that the friends of the National University proposition, from George Washington down, have never for one moment contemplated the endowment of it by the Government alone.

In the nature of things, it would become a powerful magnet for the munificence of private fortune. The minority's reference to "an addition to burdens of taxation or to the further issue of bonds" is therefore entirely without warrant.

"IS THERE A NECESSITY FOR A NATIONAL UNIVERSITY?"

After a page of history setting forth the beginnings and slow progress of the older institutions, the minority report concludes the discussion under this head with sundry statements concerning the facilities already furnished by the more than four hundred colleges and universities of the country, with "their one hundred and fifty millions in productive funds and their aggregate annual income of some twenty millions," saying last of all: "It would seem there is no longer any necessity for our young men going abroad for college training."

No; not for college training, surely. But that there is need of their going abroad for university facilities is clearly shown by the important fact that they do actually go by the thousand, and that, too, not unfrequently at a very great sacrifice.

Finally, the minority declare, most surprisingly, that, "Here in Washington, besides other institutions of high rank which are supported by private means and endowment, we have a grand University representing the Catholic faith, and the American University, representing the Protestant faith, will soon commence the erection of its buildings;" and, finally, that "present and future demands at the capital, it is believed, will be met by institutions existing and projected, embracing all branches of learning and research."

One regrets to speak of such declarations as they deserve. Surely these Senators know what constitutes a university, and it is, therefore, quite comprehensible that they should have thought to dispose of so important a matter in such a manner. Have they not, rather, in the pressure of many measures, trusted too implicitly the contributions of one whose high position has secured for him a large measure of confidence? They certainly know that the friends of a national university are not concerning themselves especially with "demands at the capital," but rather with the demands of the whole country, and that, as compared with even the foremost universities of Europe, still less with any ideal standard, there is not as yet a single university in America—an institution, I mean, above the college and embracing the whole vast field of higher learning, with the best and highest possible training in every field of original work. Upon further reflection, they must realize that if the Catholic, Methodist, and Baptist institutions at Washington were universities in even the German sense they could not, either one or all of them, meet the demands of this great people of seventy millions, embracing citizens of every sect and of no sect. If themselves satisfied that every university should bear some denominational stamp, do they not see that an institution under the most absolute Methodist rule could not meet the demands of all the other denominations? They also understand full well that in their own higher realm Letters, Science, and Philosophy, as well as original work of every kind, are of right free from denominational and party trammels of every name and nature. They must know that neither a Catholic, nor Methodist, nor Baptist, nor any other
denominational university could so relate itself to the now incomplete public-school system of the country as to supplement and complete it and thus become a potential agency for the coordination and perfection of the whole series. Nor can they fail to realize that a National University at the seat of the Government, gathering unto itself a multitude of able and aspiring college graduates from every section of the country for yet higher and the highest possible university culture, and again distributing them for supreme service in every department of intellectual and industrial activity, would become a powerful means of national progress and of national concord. And hence it is confidently believed that, upon further consideration, they also will clearly see how well grounded is the conviction of the great body of those most in touch with these matters that such a University of the United States as the Government and People are abundantly able, and therefore in duty bound, to set up would greatly advance the dignity and honor of the Republic, promoting its material prosperity, while so greatly contributing to its intellectual and moral ascendency among the nations of the earth.

"IS A NATIONAL UNIVERSITY DESIRABLE?"

This question has been more than answered already by showing that a crowning and purely post-graduate university is even necessary to the efficiency of existing institutions of learning, to the public welfare, and to the honor of the United States.

But "there are many practical difficulties in the way," say the minority. Of course. There are always difficulties in the way of every great cause—the failure to view it comprehensively, clearly, and without prejudice, being chief. But the difficulties alluded to in the report of the minority are nothing more nor less than fictitious ones, primarily conjured up and urgently offered by one intent, as it would seem, upon gaining and holding as exclusively as possible this great field of the National Capital, made rich by its millions' worth of resources at the public cost, for his own denominational institution.

With such as make no proper distinction between religion and denominationalism there may be questionings as to the spirit that would pervade a National University; but what reasonable man can doubt that the University of the United States would naturally have a religious atmosphere in the best and highest sense, even as the Government itself in all its departments is pervaded by a religious spirit? Who believes it could not and would not, in the nature of the case, deal with history, ethics, social and political economy, constitutional and international law in the broadest manner possible, presenting all the differing views of recognized authorities with a breadth, thoroughness, and completeness wholly impossible in any local or denominational university? Who will question that, because of its chief function of leadership in the vast fields of historical research and of ethical, social, economical, and general scientific investigation, it would of necessity be characterized by a supremely careful, liberal, and truth-loving spirit and practice? Who believes that a University of the United States, with its many departments under command of the foremost men of the times, could be other than loyal to truth and virtue, nay, religious in the best sense of that term—the sense in which we are and must remain a religious people, the sure and faithful guardians of interests so at once universal and vital?

Having spoken thus freely of the minority's views on these several subjects, let us turn briefly to what is said on another head, though not touched by the pending bill:

"PUBLIC LANDS."

"If it shall be proposed," say they, "to resort to the public lands for this purpose [of endowment], an objection which would seem to be decisive is, that this cannot be done without a reversal of the settled policy of the Government to devote these lands liberally to educational purposes in the States, to aid in the support of both common schools and colleges, so that the immediate benefits, so far as possible, may reach all the people. This policy seems to find full justification in the consideration that these lands, the property of the people, should, so far as devoted to educational purposes, be applied as much as practicable for the benefit of the people in general, and not to a purpose which directly at least would benefit but a limited class."

Could there be anything more illogical and unreasonable? When the Government of the United States began the creation of its educational, scientific, and industrial bureaus and departments, was it a "reversal of the settled policy of the Government," or only a "grand step forward?"

As a champion of the Morrill bill for the endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts, the writer of this review recalls the cry of similar import against that beneficent measure. That, too, was "class legislation" and "an unjustifiable use of public lands that should be educationally used for the support of common schools alone."

But for the printed text before me it would be deemed incredible that any citizen of the United States should frame such an argument against the founding of an institution whose important functions it must be: (1) To strengthen our public-school system, from kindergarten to State university, by the elevation and unification of standards and by insuring a supply of better equipped instructors and professors. (2) To increase and satisfy, in our own country, the demand of aspiring college graduates for the very best facilities for advance study the world can furnish, thus securing to the United States a new dignity in the world of science and learning. (3) Whose chief and yet more difficult task is to be that of advancing the world's knowledge by means of original investigations and by the systematic induction of qualified persons into the methods by which such investigations are made with the largest prospect of important results, whose work, therefore, from beginning to end, is to be done, not in the interest of a given locality or class, much less in the special interest of any particular religious
organization, but in the common interest of the whole American people, of a
country whose high mission it should be to lead the world in civilization.

"Limited class!" What benefactions are more universal than those of
scientific discovery? And what surer way to promote discovery than by
creating an institution one of whose leading offices it shall be to qualify
discoverers?

Is it not beyond question that the higher the work the more universal its
influence in the promotion of human welfare?

The argument of the minority, if logically and practically enforced, would
put an end to every expenditure by the State and National Governments in
the interest of higher education, much more to appropriations for our great
libraries, museums, laboratories, observatories, and scientific expeditions;
but, happily, there is no danger of this, nor could the minority themselves,
after due reflection, desire to see it applied at so great a cost to our people
and to the standing of our country among the great nations. It savors of a
discipline once held by good and able men, but which has long since given
way to the more rational view that the People are sovereign in the United
States and competent to do whatever, being without constitutional prohibi-
tion, will clearly advance the public welfare.

Surely the American people, in their capacity as a nation, having given
millions of acres of the public domain in aid of public schools, local and State,
as a potent means of strengthening all these for an increase of knowledge,
for the advancement of the State and local industries, and for the general
furtherance, may now, without question from any intelligent source, devote
yet other lands, if they will, to the universal good and for the honor of the
American name.

LETTERS ACCOMPANYING "VIEWS OF THE MINORITY."

Of the nine communications from college men which accompany the
minority report, it may be said in general terms that but four of them are
deserving of consideration, namely, those from the presidents of Pennsyl-
vania, Columbia, Yale, and Harvard universities. Of the remaining five,
two are to be found in no published list of which the writer has knowledge,
and the other three give unmistakable evidence of both a very marked prej-
dice and a singular ignorance of what constitutes a university.

Moreover, the opposition of the four really important institutions first
mentioned is in good part neutralized by its very nature; that of Yale lying
against Government appropriations in aid of higher institutions generally—
past, present, and future; that of Columbia being rather a dissent from the
scope and extent of the proposed National University and from details of
the bill than from the advantage of a National University, duly planned
and administered; that of Pennsylvania expressing a desire for some means
of utilizing "the vast collections of the United States Government in Wash-
ings for purposes of study," but distrustful of the proposed form of control;
and that of Harvard's president ignoring, as heretofore, the exclusively post-

graduate and national character of the proposed institution, as well as the
vastness of the facilities already here, mildly questioning whether there would
be due freedom for students in certain departments, and making irrelevant
allusions to the meeting of all local needs of the District of Columbia by the
institutions already here and in prospect. Only this and nothing more.

Not one of these objectors touches the great motives which have prompted the Na-
tional University movement!

In answer it is proper to say, in general terms, that the bill in question is
not of cast iron. As now before Congress, it represents the final judgment
of the dozen or more distinguished scholars and statesmen who had part in
fencing it and of the great number of prominent educators whose opinions
were solicited in correspondence. It is, of course, open to amendment—ิน-
deed, has been modified somewhat by the Senate Committee to Establish the
University of the United States.

The objections raised by President Low, of Columbia, can all be satisfied
but one—that which would deny to the University the powers of a "teaching
organization." His objection to free tuition has already been met by the
committee by the substitution of the word open for the word "free," in the
second line of section 9; and yet other changes suggested by him are likely
to be made—perhaps all the others save that which, upon further considera-
tion, he will himself see cannot be made, namely, the denial to the institu-
tion its vital function of guidance for students in their post-graduate work
in the several departments to be embraced; which guidance is nothing other
than instruction. It cannot be that so able a man as he could think of turn-
ing loose some hundreds, perhaps thousands, of earnest seekers after the
ultimate known and the unknown to grope their way in the vast fields to be
opened to their inquiry; nor would he deny to the distinguished corps of
guides to be furnished them the privilege of dealing with them in groups
and by means of lectures, instead of with each alone. Having conceded
so much as this, he will have yielded the whole ground—all that is asked.

As for President Eliot, of Harvard, it is highly gratifying, in view of his
sweeping objections of a quarter of a century ago, to find him conceding
that the present measure has been made "more acceptable" than former
ones, and that, since the progress of civil service reform, one may now hope
that the proposed University would be at least in good measure "exempted
from the operations of the spoils system"—a system which every day be-
comes more and more a thing of the past, which never had and never can
have any disturbing influence in the high realms of science and learning.
For the remaining part, being notably a conservative educator, the Doctor
unduly takes counsel of his fears. After all his concessions and in view of
the fact that he stands for the oldest, if not the greatest, of American col-
egiate institutions, with a natural pride of supremacy, and has been taught
to cherish something of a prejudice against public education, it is not diffi-
cult to pardon his failure to recognize all such high claims of our movement
as rest upon the place the National University would hold in the American
system and upon the nationalizing and harmonizing influence it could not fail to exert upon the country.

The suggestions made by Provost Harrison, of the University of Pennsylvania, have evidently come, in like manner, from a misapprehension of the real intent of the framers of the pending bill. He doubtless had in mind a series of fixed and unvarying courses of study, after the manner of annual classes in the existing institutions, rather than that free and varying work of guidance of which mention has been made, and which it would be the business of those in charge to make as valuable as possible in each individual case; which entire great work would also be conducted with due reference to the interests of all other institutions, especially those to any considerable extent similarly engaged, as provided in section 10 of the pending bill, which reads as follows:

"Sec. 10. That the University shall have authority to establish with other institutions of learning in this and other countries such cooperative relations as shall be deemed advantageous."

Provost Harrison wisely says:

"If some arrangement could be made by which advanced students should have the benefit of the vast collections of the United States Government at Washington for purposes of study, that would be an excellent arrangement."

And we simply add that such benefit could only come in due measure from the very kind of assistance proposed—from the help to be given by men of genius, masters, each, in their several fields of inquiry.

As for the communication of Bishop Hurst, chancellor of the so-called "American University," it is a singular mixture, demanding a large amount of charity from both the national and the ethical points of view.

Cherishing prejudices against public education and having succeeded, with the help of a usurped title and liberal assurances, in gaining a handsome sum from citizens of Washington for the purchase of grounds, he resumes his true role of sectarian, mingling with his adverse declarations such affectation of sympathy with "the interests of higher education" and such pretension to reasons therefor (which he finds himself sadly without) as are very surprising.

How truly "American" his institution would be, in other words, with what singleness of purpose "the interests of higher education in this country" would be guarded and advanced if left to Bishop Hurst and the institution to be managed by him may be inferred, first, from the terms of a charter requiring not only that "at all times at least two-thirds of the trustees and also the chancellor of the said University shall be members of the aforesaid Methodist Episcopal Church," but that "all trustees elected after the 1st day of December, A. D. 1891, shall be submitted to the General Conference of said Church for its approval;" secondly, from the spirit of the man most conspicuous in the founding of it, and, third, from the avowed aims of some of his ecclesiastical coadjutors, as set forth in their addresses before the General Conference in 1892 (pages 106–108 of Senate "Memorial"), from which the following brief quotations are made:

From the address of Rev. Dr. Payne:

"Methodism is building for a vast future and for uncounted millions. Let us build this glorious temple of Methodism [the 'American University'] with its marble front toward the future; build for the coming generations; build for all the years of time and eternity."

From the address of Bishop Fowler:

"This American University, located at the heart of the nation, not far from the most distant home, with vast accumulations of appliances [by the Government], and to offer the utmost possible advantage, cannot long wait for any good thing. 

"If we fail to see our day of opportunity, we shall drop into the rear and cease to do our part for the evangelization of this land and the world, and that sad voice from the broken-hearted watcher of Olivet will come to us, saying, 'O Methodist, Methodist, if thou hast known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong to thy peace!'"

From the address of Rev. Dr. (Chaplain) McCabe:

"If the past is prophetic of the future, this American University will have much to do with the cause of missions. The name of a university professor is a household word in Methodism, because it is connected with that all-conquering theology which is believable and preachable and which is destined to take the world—James Arminius, of the University of Leyden."

From the address of Bishop Newman:

"Provident ordinat the times and seasons according to an infinite wisdom, and raises up men to accomplish the exalted purposes of Jehovah. "It comes to us more and more that in the roll of the centuries, in the ordering of time, God Almighty, the God of our fathers, has selected Bishop Hurst to lay the foundation of the American University FOR AMERICAN METHODISM."

Had these things been said of a Methodist University of America, criticism would not be in order, for denominational institutions have a right to be that should be scrupulously regarded, even as the people through their agencies, the State and National Governments, may of right establish and maintain public schools and higher institutions that shall be wholly free from denominational influence. But no institution has the moral right to hang out a false banner, whether for the sake of larger endowments or as a means of securing increased patronage, much less as a means of forestalling and preventing the establishment of an institution for which there is clearly an important demand by the entire country without regard to section. And how do the charter provisions and public expressions above quoted tally with the high claims of "Protestant," "non-sectarian"—nay, "American"? And how far do they illustrate and confirm the claim of Bishop Hurst to a supreme solicitude for "the interests of higher education"?

Again, can any one believe that in the coming National University he sees "only danger to our educational system"? What "educational system"? Our only educational system is the public educational system, in which he does not believe; to which, apparently, he only yields assent for policy sake, or rather because it is established and he cannot abolish it:—a system still incomplete and sadly needing the very National University in question as the only means of providing it with the necessary coordinating, stimulating, and inspiring head.

Tolerating the common schools and State universities, which he ventured to name as the first two elements of our American system, for a third and
final member of the series he adds: "The post-graduate and professional schools to be left to the voluntary benevolence of the individual citizen." Why? It would probably trouble the Bishop as much to answer this question as to account for his misrepresentation of the university purposes of George Washington (see Majority Report of Senate Committee, March 10, 1896, pp. 44 and 45) in his argument of February 21. There are many reasons why the higher education should not be left to the chances of individual and denominational provision and control; but we challenge this ecclesiastical objector to give one valid reason for his singular proposition. If compelled to divulge his thought, it would doubtless be found to have a sectarian cast; else why should he have even dreamed of calling upon the Church to prevent the establishment of the National University? And yet what inconsistency does this involve! For, having consented (on paper) to the training of American youth in the public schools during their tender years, and to their higher education in "the State universities and colleges" during the period of adolescence—the formative periods, when, if ever, they should have religious guardianship—why such profound anxiety for their moral and spiritual welfare after they have attained to the years of manhood and entered upon such post-graduate study as directly takes hold on the business of life?

And what does the Bishop mean by "ministerial and other associations" in such connection? Is he really planning to "rally the Christian Church," as he has ventured to intimate, against the effort of patriotic citizens to complete the American system of public education? Does he think his own spirit of sectarianism is so universal that all the 143 religious sects in the United States stand ready to array themselves under his leadership for such a crusade? How great a mistake! Not one of them will enlist in so unpatriotic, absurd, not to say wicked, a war. Already he finds one great religious organization (and that the one from which he would vainly protect the people!) quite competent to teach him worthy lessons, not only in patriotism, but also in religious toleration, as will appear by the following communication from that broad-minded and distinguished leader in many fields of beneficent work, the learned Rector of the Catholic University of America:

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA.
WASHINGTON, D. C., April 16, 1896.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR HOYT: Accept my thanks for your kindness in sending me Congressional documents connected with the proposed National University. Accept also my thanks for your very kind estimate of my attitude toward the project. We will do the best we can here to give the very highest and best education, but we will do nothing to hinder others from doing as well, or better, if they can.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) JOHN J. KEANE,
Rector (per Sec.).

HON. JOHN W. HOYT,
4 Iowa Circle, Washington, D. C.
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED,
TO PROMOTE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF THE UNITED STATES.

JOHN W. HOYT, CHAIRMAN,
4TH IOWA CIRCLE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

May 30th, 1896.

My Dear Sir:

While the National University Movement has gathered much strength in the country at large, so that there is every reason to expect its ultimate if not quite early triumph, it has nevertheless, for a number of reasons, made less progress than had been expected in Congress, and does not now seem likely to come up for final action in either House during the present session.

The hindrances, frankly stated, have been these:

1. The condition of the country, industrially and financially, causing extreme caution in dealing with measures involving, or supposed to involve, large expenditures, future, if not present, and which by the average legislator are at first thought deemed less than absolutely necessary.

2. The absorption of all members of Congress to a remarkable extent in questions of a more political bearing, and in the results of the coming conventions and elections, on which account no measure of national importance and wholly outside of this general range has received great consideration.

3. The open and active opposition of the Chancellor and other officers of the Methodist University, so-called "American"—opposition by no means confined to arguments before the Senate Committee to Establish the University of the United States (a review of which you have found upon pages 42—47 of the Report of said Committee submitted by Senator Kyle on March 10), but which extended to personal interviews with Senators and Members, and even to machinations and combinations quite outside of the usual course in such matters.

4. The consequent caution of some friends of our measure in both Houses, and their disposition, as it would seem, to pass the dangers incident to the coming conventions and elections before taking up a measure which it was feared might encounter the opposition of the Methodist Church as a body, if not as an organization.

5. Last but not least, the repeated and quite protracted absence from Washington of the Chairman and other members of the Senate Committee during the very period in the now closing session when our measure could reasonably have been expected to receive consideration and action—the period moreover, during which, on account of non-action and apparent laxity, the Minority Report was conceived, devised and brought forward, wholly contrary to the most positive assurances from responsible sources on both sides of the question.
Dear Sir,

While the educational University Movement has suffered
much in the community at large, as is true in every
crest of the political and economic tide, it is not.

The fact that the University Movement has

been up to the present time, and that the tone

of the committee of the University has been

supporting to the advancement of the University,

and which is why the University is known to be

resistant to pressure necessary.

The more or less opposition of the Governor

in the matter of the "American University"

has led to the conclusion of the committee of

the University that the "American University"

is a far more serious threat to the University

than the present situation.

The committee of the University has been

seeking to place the University in a position

where it can continue to maintain its position

as an institution of higher learning. The University

has always been a leader in the field of higher

education. It is now recognized as an organiza-

tion that is working to maintain the University's

standing in the community and to advance the

interests of the University.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
Nevertheless, there is no occasion for despondency. The University proposition has among its friends many of the strongest men in either House, and there is a resolute purpose among them to get the measure up promptly at the opening of the next session and to put it through. It has a prominent place on the Calendar in the Senate and is likely to receive early and favorable consideration.

The supreme arrogance of Bishop Hurst, Chancellor of the Methodist University, in assuming that a collegiate institution whose charter provides in perpetuity for more than a two-thirds Methodist rule can meet the demands of this great nation, with its soon-to-be one hundred millions of people of all denominations and of no denomination, for a truly American University of the highest post-graduate rank, and with such relations to all the schools, colleges and universities of lower grade as to make it worthily complete the whole series—this, I say, should have its fitting rebuke in the more resolute co-operation of all citizens with whom the highest learning, the progress of Science, and the growth of a genuine patriotism, are interests greater and dearer than mere sect-extension on the part of any ambitious organization however numerous and important.

But there is need of earnest, systematic and persistent work on the part of all who desire the early establishment of a great and free University of the United States—such a university, I mean, as shall be without shackles or trammels of any sort; that shall be superior to narrowing limitations of any kind, whether personal, partisan, or sectarian. And this great end it is especially the solemn duty of all members of the National University Committee of One Hundred to keep distinctly in view; contributing as they can of their counsel to its Chairman, and of their personal influence among political friends, with organized bodies, and especially with their Senators and Members of Congress, both present and prospective.

With renewed assurances of great respect, I remain, dear Sir,

Very truly and cordially yours,

[Signature]

Chairman National University Com. of 100.

[Signature of W.R. Harper, L.L.D., President of University of Chicago]
The supreme purpose of higher education, as I see it, is to prepare the young men of our country to become leaders of the future, to be citizens of the future, and to contribute to the welfare of society. It is the responsibility of the universities to provide the best possible education for our students, to ensure that they are prepared to meet the challenges of the future, and to instill in them a sense of responsibility and citizenship. We must work together to ensure that our universities remain at the forefront of knowledge and innovation, and that they continue to be a source of inspiration and leadership for our society.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Chairman, Metropolitan University, Inc.

My Dear Princeton Company:

Be assured that I am grateful for your noble letter of the 1st just received. Nothing could have better

it, and it comes in just the right time to do us great good.

On account of the rapid dwindling of the land proceeds, it has been thought neces-

sary to adopt some

other means of pro-
And accordingly John Heman promised an out and out money appropriation of one million a year for ten years.

The strongest men in the Senate are with us, as far as I know them. Manners waiting for the demand of the enterprise by the leading dictionaries of the day, especially your own, before approaching your niceties. It may be your pleasure to reach them directly.
1234 Mass. Avenue

My Dear President:
Please accept my grateful acknowledgment for your cordial word of receipt.

The publication papers [Memorial of the President] were sent by express according to your request. When they had been (if only kindly) and the last day before his [unintelligible] death wrote
One of his great desires to promote the enterprise. It is much I know that you are to decide with us in spirit.

Yours truly cordially, 

[Signature]

To Print Hill Harper, 

Chicago, Illinois
August 26, 1896.

My dear President Harper:

Grateful for your recent letter of explanation, I made another effort to explain the reason for the delay, and upon failure there, wrote to a few other members of the Committee whose names occurred to me (in a general way) in order to assure them that they would help me out of the present pinch, if nothing more. But, strangely enough, not one of them has answered—probably because, like to many others, they were away from home.

Accordingly, I come again to you asking whether, as a means of saving the end of the Committee, you cannot at least budge the $100 until I can reach others or raise something of a fund.
I will help you to meet an undertaking
looking prepared to keep the needful
money. You may conclude it ad libitum.

So long a period of our Federal

ministers are now without power

increase that I am in no circumstances
expect from these more than very
scanty means, I should much prefer

to draw upon them for another

year. Two or three persons in Senate

are considering the question of granting

an adequate endowment for the new

ment, but they cannot be hurried.

If it all I can now promise

do to provide for my personal and

family expenses, and other matters

at the nearer of the Company itself to the

school of providing funds for necessary

printing, letter-writings, papers, etc., etc.

And I hope that we can all be

able to respond affably. And thirdly

Avery,

Very truly yours,

Assistant W. R. Harper

F. D. Weston
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED,
TO PROMOTE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF THE UNITED STATES.

JOHN W. HOYT, CHAIRMAN,
4 IOWA CIRCLE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 29, 1896.

My dear Dr. Byers:

Although I wrote you last month,

the circumstances cause me to write again. 

As far as I know, I have not had the

opportunity to express my views on the

matter. 

I believe that the University must

seriously suffer unless other friends of the

cause come to the rescue. 

Much as I am

willing to meet the expenses of the campaign,

I must do it - certainly not for a
time.

I am afraid the President of the

University has not yet realized the

need.

Accordingly, I recently wrote

and a circular letter inviting subscriptions to

the university. 

I am pleased to announce that

the number of subscribers has increased

greatly.

Yours truly,

John W. Hooyt
apoplexy of nature, and money for election
strategy, also for a visit from weeks before
or New York where there is plenty of
making the event, personal notices
the money more effective.

Shue had 

Wheeler's millions

were at Washington if he's been

two weeks earlier. He told me so.

Can you not lend me one of the

twenty-five?

Realizing the unhealthiness

the illness of his kidney, he had with a

broken arm and many other complications,

I am working day and night

this meeting may wind up some

offices. Meanwhile as before denying my

defeat. The purpose for personal

furtherance in many fields, known, profes-
sional, political

Shue #5 to look small in the

Light of a large headed man with re-

duces communicating with the "great men" as

now he is able communicate. There can be

no objection to naming the list (very small)

which includes: B Idah, Ebers, Dr. Pepper,

White, Dr. Hunter, Hender, Gardner, Hubbell,

and Smith of Ky, each will have 00.

Most truly and cordially yours,

[Signature]
My dear President,

Well assured that, with so many problems of other kinds, you are now removed from the Washington political arena, and at least some attention, once more, to the great burden to which I am devoting all my time and energy, I am happy to learn that the National League of Conservation is still alive and is more advanced by every means to carry forward both before and during the coming session of Congress.

Thus relieving ourselves, announcing whatever needs and duties remain, we mean to meet the very
Case it would be very well indeed to have your own views touching any of its provisions not allowable.

The original bill - The one recommended report by the Senate Committee of the Senate heretofore for an amendment to the Acts of the U.S., and in order of the law of Deceased Officers in Secu-

rity, and other members on account of a change herein. A future move, of protecting them in their welfare.我是看

with particular reference to said statement of the third amendment, as far as possible.

Again thanking you for your valuable support for any such further assistance as may enable to render assistance.

Yours truly,

[signature]

[addressee]

P.S. I beg to ask your Report of Committee, Series of the

In the "and my Reply" with the

Add this a with a letter.
Washington, D. C., April 10th, 1895.

Dear Sir:

Owing to the extraordinary pressure of financial and foreign matters, as well as of the necessary appropriation bills during the recent final session of the 53rd Congress, the Senate's Select Committee to establish the University of the United States found it impossible to call up their bill a second time. Hence no vote was taken, although there was strong confidence in its success, in case of action, and every effort was made to reach it.

Accordingly, we are now planning a new campaign, with the purpose to have the bill re-introduced early in the first session of the next Congress (perhaps in both Houses simultaneously), and to push it to a final passage at the earliest possible day.

Among the measures looking to this end, we have planned the forming of a new and yet larger committee of promotion, to embrace not only eminent scholars in many fields, but likewise a number of the most distinguished of American jurists, statesmen, and men of affairs — a National Committee of One Hundred (or more) formed by consent of its members; its will to be executed by an executive committee of five or seven members conveniently located.

Of course no name will be included in the permanent list of members without authority. So please kindly favor us with permission to use your own name as early as may be convenient; not doubting that you will be consulted upon all important matters or that the most scrupulous consideration for the rights and interests of
Dear Sir:

OG

The importance of the emergency peculiar to the maintenance of the national life and the economic progress of the country, as well as of the necessary appropriation of the funds required to carry out the plan of the United States Department of the Interior to meet the emergency, is regarded with the highest importance. It may be of interest to call your attention to the recent page 96 of the House of Representatives of the United States, where a number of appropriations have been made by the House and Senate to meet the emergency. In case of action, any and all other necessary funds must be made to be able to proceed.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
members will govern in the management of the Committee's affairs in general.

Having once formed the National Committee as proposed, we shall proceed with the printing and distribution of such Senate and other documents as are deemed important, and with a greatly enlarged correspondence, as well as to the holding of personal interviews with influential citizens in many sections, and possibly also to the delivery of public addresses where the same are deemed especially desirable; keeping always in mind the two-fold importance of making earnest friends for our cause among the members of the coming Congress.

Demands for money will be made upon no member of the Committee; but we shall confidently expect their friendly advice and hope for their personal influence at all convenient times. Money will certainly be needed for so vigorous a campaign as we propose to make, but men of fortune are seriously considering the matter of pledging endowments for one or more chairs in the University, to be confirmed and made available upon its actual establishment by the Government and meanwhile to yield a sufficient amount, in the form of interest, to constitute a working fund. We are confident, therefore, that means for carrying forward the enterprise will not be wanting.

I have the honor to be,

Very respectfully yours,

Chairman of National University Committee

Dr. William R. Harper, President Chicago University.
Department of National University Committee

In general.

Having once formed the National Committee an adversary may proceed with the printing and distribution of such reports and other communiques as he deems important, and with a certain degree of correspondence, it may as to the interval of gathering information with National Affairs in many sections, and your strength especially germane to the efficiency of your Department, more the same way into the compelling of party alliances, the more it is true to say that the importance of making contact that you are aware more and more the more part of the national Congress.

Remember for money will be made now no member of the Congress.

Note: And my small contribution about their truly sincere view and note for short partial influence of the government it note will continue as needed for an advocate and proceed to make put the end of the country's constitution. The matter of quick accomplishment to one or more parts in the University.

To be continued and make satisfactory upon the agency of this moment in the government and common interest of every intelligent body. We are con-

I have the honor to be,

Very Respectfully yours,

Chairman of National University Committee

[Signature]
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1885.

Dear Sir:

Desiring to interest you in the effort making to secure the establishment of a National Post-Graduate University at Washington, I have mailed to you Senate documents which deal with that subject, and now take the liberty of asking your careful attention to their contents. A mere glance will show that the general proposition originated with the founders of the Republic and that it has been urged at various times by many of our most illustrious citizens.

Briefly summarized, the leading objects to be gained by the establishment of such an institution are these:

1. Facilities, full and complete, for such graduates of the colleges and universities of the country as, desiring to make post-graduate studies of the most thorough and exhaustive character, are now constrained, for want of such facilities at home, to seek them in the Old World.

2. Facilities of every sort for original work in the various fields of investigation; many of which facilities, in the form of libraries, museums, laboratories, observatories, and the like, are now here and available in a large degree, to say nothing of the hundreds of learned men here gathered, whose services could be utilized to a considerable extent with but little cost.
Dear Sir:

I am writing to express my sincere appreciation for the excellent work you put into the project. The expertise and dedication you showed throughout the process were truly impressive. Your attention to detail and commitment to quality are qualities that I have come to expect from your team.

I believe that your work has significantly contributed to the success of our project. Your ability to handle complex issues with ease and your willingness to go the extra mile have not gone unnoticed. I am confident that your contributions will be recognized and valued by all involved.

Thank you again for your hard work and excellence. I look forward to working with you on future projects.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]
3. That co-ordinating, harmonizing and elevating influence upon all the educational institutions of the country which a crowning University, with supreme standards, could alone exert.

4. That increase of patriotic sentiment throughout the United States which the founders of the Government had in view when they urged the establishment of such a University at the National Capital, and which must necessarily result from the bringing of hundreds of the college graduates of all sections to a common center, for friendly association under influences of the most enlightening and liberalizing character — influences, the value of which cannot be over-estimated in view of the dangers which still threaten the peace and prosperity of the Republic.

5. That increased dignity and glory of our country which must come of making it foremost among the nations for the advancement of knowledge, with consequent powers of attraction for ambitious students and rare scholars of other lands — of making the United States, in short, the supreme power as promoter of the progress and welfare of mankind.

It will appear from a further examination of the documents forwarded that the bill for the establishment of "The University of the United States" was prepared and is approved by scholars of the highest competency, including the presidents of a very large and steadily increasing number of colleges and universities; that it has been twice unanimously reported by the ablest of Senate Committees, and that it was recently advocated with much force upon the floor of the Senate.
The co-operation, parental guidance and educational influence
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Because of the extraordinary pressure of many important measures having the lead it could not be brought to a vote, though it seemed to have gained the general sympathy of that body and was certain to be championed by distinguished representatives of every great section, in case of its being reached.

The temper of the House of Representatives has not as yet been determined, but the greater number of its members will of course necessitate more effort to insure the success of our measure in that body. Nevertheless, as you will see by the accompanying partial list of eminent citizens who warmly support it, and who as a National University Committee of One Hundred are expected to promote its success, as they may find it convenient, there is good reason to hope that it may be carried during the 54th Congress.

If, after due consideration, you should be willing to signify your approval of the general proposition, we should be most happy to have your authority for also counting you among its friends.

I have the honor to be with great respect,

Your obedient servant,

Chairman of National University Committee.
In the present critical period of our important work,

more than ever the task can be started to a vote, though

seemed to have raised the General sympathy of that body and was
certain to be strong in its representation of our

Great nation, as the peace demands.

The power of the House of Representatives was not as not

borne of the House of Representatives was not as not

a power necessary more effective to improve the success of our current

form to power. Nevertheless, as you will see by the accompanying

bears all the marks of earnest effort and hearty support. In any case, an

important University Committee of one hundred and forty, the

pursue the success as they may, they if accomplished, serve in good

reason to hope that it may be carried during the next Congress.

If, after due consideration, you should be willing to apply

your support to the General proposition, we shall be most happy

to have your assistance for the committee, you know the influence

I have the power to do with great respect,

YOUR OBEDIENT SERVANT,

Chairman of the National University Committee.
Partial List of Distinguished Citizens who Endorse the National University Measure and are expected to have membership in the National University Committee of One Hundred.

Hon. Melville W. Fuller, Chief Justice of the United States.
Ex-United States Senators George F. Edmunds, of Vt.; Eppa Hunton, of Va.; Patrick Walsh, of Ga.; W. V. Ransom, of N. C.; Jas. F. Wilson, Ia.; W. D. Washburn, Minn.; Joseph H. Dolph, Or.;
Hon. Andrew D. White, LL. D., late U. S. Minister to Russia.
President Daniel G. Gilman, LL. D., Johns Hopkins University.
Dr. William Pepper, M. D., LL. D., Ex-Provost University of Penn.
President J. C. Schumman, LL. D., Cornell University.
President Jas. B. Angell, LL. D., University of Michigan.
President Chas. Louis Loos, LL. D., Kentucky University.
President Chas. W. Dabney, LL. D., University of Tennessee.
President W. H. Scott, LL. D., State University of Ohio.
President William R. Harper, LL. D., University of Chicago.
President Chas. A. Schaeffer, LL. D., University of Iowa.
President R. H. Jesse, LL. D., University of Missouri.
President Jas. H. Canfield, LL. D., University of Nebraska.
President David S. Jordan, LL. D., Leland Stanford University, Cal.

Nearly 100 Presidents of other Universities and Colleges.
Dr. S. P. Langley, LL. D., Secretary, Smithsonian Institution.
Dr. G. Brown Goode, LL. D., Ass't Sec. in Charge of Nat'l Museum.
Dr. Smith Newcomb, LL. D., Superintendent, Nautical Almanac.
Major J. W. Powell, LL. D., Director, U. S. Bureau of Ethnology.
Dr. Chas. D. Walcott, LL. D., Director, U. S. Geological Survey.
Dr. W. W. Duffield, LL. D., Supt., Coast and Geodetic Survey.
General John Eaton, LL. D., former U. S. Commissioner of Education.
The State Superintendents of Public Instruction of most of the States.
Dr. D. C. Briston, LL. D., President American Association for the Advancement of Science.
Dr. Edmund J. James, LL. D., President, American Academy of Political and Social Science.
Dr. George F. Darker, LL. D., President, American Philosophical Society.
Major Henry E. Alward, President, American Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experimental Stations.
Hon. Gardner C. Hubbard, LL. D., President, National Geographic Society, Treasurer of Committee.

Nearly 100 Presidents of other Universities and Colleges.